

500 p. 10.
DOCUMENT No. 2.

THE COMMERCIAL
RELATIONS
BETWEEN GERMANY
AND THE
UNITED STATES

THE GERMANIA PRESS
5-BEEKMAN STREET
NEW YORK CITY



THE FIRST TREATY of perfect equality and reciprocity in commercial relations into which the United States of America entered was the one with Frederick the Great of Prussia, concluded September 10th, in the year 1785, at the Hague, with Privy Councillor F. G. de Thulemeier as Prussian Plenipotentiary.

Congress must have considered this treaty of weighty importance because on the part of the United States there had been intrusted with the negotiations: John Adams, then Minister Plenipotentiary at London, President of the United States from 1797-1801; Dr. Benjamin Franklin; and Thomas Jefferson, then Minister Plenipotentiary at Paris, President of the United States from 1801-1809—the best minds of the country.

These paragraphs are expressive of the spirit of the treaty:

“His Majesty, the King of Prussia, and the United States of America, desiring to fix, in a permanent manner, the rules to be observed in the increase of commerce between their respective countries, His Majesty and the United States have judged that the said end cannot be better obtained *than by taking the most perfect equality and reciprocity for the basis of their agreement*, and do agree

“That there shall be a firm, inviolable and universal peace and sincere friendship between His Majesty the King of Prussia, his heirs, successors and subjects on the one part, and the United States of America on the other, without exception of persons or places.”

The life of this treaty was ten years.

A “renewed Treaty of Amity and Commerce” between His Majesty, the King of Prussia, and the United States of America was concluded at Berlin, July 11, 1799, during the presidency of John Adams, one of the signers of the first treaty of 1785; ratifications advised by the Senate, February 18, 1800; ratified by the President February 19, 1800; ratifications exchanged at Berlin, June 22, 1800; proclaimed, November 4, 1800.

For the negotiations the American Plenipotentiary was John Quincy Adams, then Minister Plenipotentiary at the Court of His Prussian Majesty, President of the United States from 1825-1829. This time it was the King of Prussia who distinguished the negotiations and the affair by appointing as his plenipotentiaries his highest ministers of state and most trusted advisers, as can be seen from the preamble to the treaty:

“His Majesty, the King of Prussia, and the United States of America, desiring to maintain upon a stable and permanent footing the connection of good understanding which has hitherto so happily subsisted between their respective States, and for this purpose to renew the treaty of Amity and Commerce, concluded between the two powers at the Hague, the 10th of September 1785, for the term of 10 years, His Prussian Majesty has nominated and constituted as his Plenipotentiaries the Count Charles William de Finkenstein, his Minister of State, of War, and of the Cabinet, Knight of the Orders of the Black Eagle and of the Red Eagle, and Commander of that of St. John of Jerusalem; the Baron Philip Charles d’Alvensleben, his Minister of State, of War and of the Cabinet, Knight of the Orders of the Black Eagle and of the Red Eagle, and Commander of that of St. John of Jerusalem; and the Count Christian Henry Curt de Haugwitz, his Minister of State, of War and of the Cabinet, Knight of the Orders of the Black Eagle and of the Red Eagle.”

This treaty reaffirmed all the sentiments of good will and sincere friendship expressed in the first covenant between the two nations.

Further development in the intercourse made amendments necessary and during the Presidency of John Quincy Adams, the signer of the second treaty of 1799, negotiations were carried on between Secretary of State Henry Clay and the Sieur Ludwig Niederstetter, Chargé d’Affaires of His Majesty the King of Prussia.

This treaty was concluded May 1, 1828; ratification advised May 4, 1828; ratification again advised and time for exchange extended March 9, 1829; ratifications exchanged at Washington, March 14, 1829; proclaimed by President Andrew Jackson, March 14, 1829.

Again desire is expressed in the preamble to maintain the relations of good understanding:

"The United States of America and His Majesty the King of Prussia, equally animated with the desire of maintaining the relations of good understanding, which have hitherto so happily subsisted between their respective States, of extending, also, and consolidating the commercial intercourse between them, and convinced that this object cannot better be accomplished than by adopting the system of an entire freedom of navigation, and a perfect reciprocity, based upon principles of equity equally beneficial to both countries, and applicable in time of peace, as well as in time of war, have, in consequence, agreed to enter into negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty of navigation and commerce, etc., etc."

The fourth and last Reciprocity treaty was initiated, negotiated and concluded during the administration of President William McKinley. This agreement was in conformity with the authority conferred on the President in section 3 of the Customs Act of the United States, approved July 24, 1897 (the Dingley bill).

It was signed by Secretary of State John Hay and Ambassador Von Holleben on July 10, 1900.

This agreement in consideration of reduced tariff rates on certain German products put the United States on the same footing with the powers which had concluded commercial treaties with Germany during the years 1891-1894.

* * *

This short historical summary makes it manifest that the two great sister nations have lived in harmonious commercial peace relations ever since the great Republic of the West took her place among the free and independent nations of the world. Why should there, in these late days, be a change in the pleasant intercourse which has been mutually so beneficial?

We owe a debt to Germany. She rejoiced with us in sunny days. She also proved a friend in need. Her sons have become loyal citizens of their adopted land. Trace any industry in America to its origin and a German pioneer will be found. The stability of the Protective Tariff System is a sacred creed among many German-Americans.

So why should there be any disagreement in these late days?

Still it must be confessed that for some time there has been a good deal of unpleasant friction, especially in the public opinion of the two nations. Only recently a tariff war between Germany and the United States was avoided in the very last moment, and, in justice it must be stated, mainly through the peace desiring attitude of Germany.

On February 22nd this year the Imperial German Government asked the *Reichstag* for the authority to extend provisionally the reciprocal tariff rates to the United States until June 30th, 1907, "not as a right under the most favored nation interpretation but in order that the negotiations pending may be conducted to a satisfactory end and because it is in the interest of both countries to avoid a tariff war."

The *Reichstag* desirous to give the United States all the time possible for mature consideration granted the government's request by a large majority. This action was taken in spite of the fact that the German government had been **compelled** by her trade arrangements with other nations to denounce on November 30th last year the Reciprocity treaty with the United States concluded in 1900, the termination to take effect March 1st, 1906.

The provisional makeshift arranged in the last days of February this year means that the final settlement of the entire question of trade relations between the two nations has been put off for sixteen months, that is before or until June 30th, 1907. The correspondence exchanged on this occasion clearly proves that Germany has no desire to be the aggressor in a disturbance of the commercial peace. It's out of place here to analyze the motive which

prompted the German government to make these conciliatory concessions, **but those who maintain that this postponement is likely to be a permanent one misjudge the situation.**

What then is the situation?

If Germany were a free agent in this tariff matter such permanent postponement might be or might not be the case. But she is not. In the policy of her foreign trade relations she has to live up to the agreements made with other nations. These sacred covenants stipulate specifically that neither of the contracting parties is permitted to grant the concessions mutually agreed to to other nations without equivalents of the same value. Consequently, Germany, however much she might wish to do so for the purpose of obliging us as a friendly nation, is powerless to grant us **permanently** without adequate reciprocal concessions on our part the same conventional tariff rates which she conceded to the seven signatory powers, viz. Russia, Austro-Hungary, Italy, Belgium, Roumania, Servia and Switzerland, only after these powers had framed commercial treaties with Germany for mutual advantage.

In other words through the present provisional arrangement we get from Germany practically for nothing tariff favors for which friendly and neighborly powers have to pay dollar for dollar. It stands to reason that these powers have already just and sufficient reason for complaint, because during the life time of this provisional arrangement the United States is treated by Germany as **more** than **most favored nation**. If, let us assume it for argument's sake, this provisional arrangement in its present form should be extended to permanency then these seven signatory powers would be fully justified—and in fact they would not hesitate a moment to do so—to cancel immediately on the ground of non-fulfillment of honorable obligation their treaty arrangements with Germany.

It is proper to discuss right here the assertion "Germany cannot afford to enforce her position, in a trade war with the United States she would lose more than win." This may be true as regards the last sentence, but, however deplorable Germany might and undoubtedly would consider the loss of her trade with the United States her loss would be a thousand times greater if the seven signatory powers were to cancel their trade arrangements with her on account of her over-friendly attitude to the United States. Her trade with the United States is fluctuating and uncertain, but that with her neighbors is certain and increasing. From this it can be deducted that if forced to the alternative of choosing between her American trade and that of the signatory powers' common commercial prudence would compel her to decide against us, much as she might dislike doing so.

This is in plain words the situation.

Our present position in asserting that we treat Germany like all other nations but claiming under the most favored nation clause, without making any reciprocal concessions of adequate equivalent, favors granted by Germany to other nations for *quid pro quo* is neither morally correct nor just in international relations.

Besides are we treating all nations alike?

Have we not granted exceptional rights to Cuba? Are we not giving to some nations the preferential rates—such as they are—provided in Section 3 of the Dingley Act without giving them to all? Are we not then discriminating ourselves? Have we not by treaty enactment given approval to certain discriminations on the part of France? Are not Spain, Portugal and certain English possessions like Canada, South Africa and Australasia discriminating against us without our retaliation?

Now as regards the most favored nation clause.

The treaty of 1829 between the United States and Prussia, which is claimed to have become automatically operative for the whole of Germany through the formation of that empire with Prussia as the leading State, says in Paragraph IX:

"If either party shall hereafter grant to any other nation any particular favor in navigation or commerce, it shall immediately become common to the other party, freely where it is freely granted to such other nation, or on yielding the same compensation where the grant is conditional."

There is the point.

If Germany had granted **freely** favors to others we would have been entitled under this clause to obtain also **freely** the very same favors. But this is not the case. In fact the tariff grant, that is the minimum rates, by Germany to the previously mentioned seven signatory powers was **conditional on yielding compensation**. Yet we refuse any compensation. We demand that Germany grants us these favors freely and if refused we threaten as was done by the McCleary bill to add horizontally 25 per cent. to the Dingley rates on all German imports.

This is not just! This is not fair!

The trouble is that Germany's position is not clearly and correctly understood. Otherwise public opinion would be reversed. Because we must not forget that the United States is a proud and just nation. We certainly do not want something for nothing and we most assuredly do not need charity. Public opinion in the United States, if it once grasps the point at issue will most emphatically insist that we "render unto Caesar what is Caesar's," in other words that we pay for favors the same compensation which other and smaller and poorer nations are paying for the same favors.

Moreover:

Through a reciprocity treaty we have made **freely** concessions to the free and independent Republic of Cuba without granting these concessions, as we were bound to do under the treaty of 1829, to Germany, and German trade, especially sugar, has suffered great damage through these allowances. Germany has a right to feel aggrieved on this score as is even admitted by the American Protective Tariff League.

But Germany wants to write our tariff laws, say some. Absurd! She only wants fair play. In fact, if Germany were consulted by us in this respect she would emphatically declare in favor of American protection because she is a protective tariff nation and she knows that the wealth of a nation is based on the producer.

To sum up:

We grant favors to other nations which we deny to Germany.

Yet she must not complain.

We permit other countries to apply their maximum tariff rates to American goods, notable among them Spain, France, Portugal and the English possessions, towit Canada, South Africa and Australasia, which latter grant preferential rates to their mother country. We have even by treaty enactment of May 28, 1898 given approval to certain discriminations in the French tariff.

But—Germany is a "horse of another color."

We demand favors from Germany freely for which other nations pay adequately and when Germany requests that we either yield the same compensation as these other nations have done, or pay her regular tariff rates we are horrified and exclaim:

Germany discriminates against us.

We treat German exporters worse than criminals because we do not even allow them an open trial and confiscate their property without court proceedings. But we demand that Germany accept the statements of our exporters as holy writ when it is notoriously known that some American goods, as for instance those of the Steel Trust, can be purchased abroad much cheaper with transportation, duty and all other incidental costs added than manufacturers' price in the United States. Germany's export price for surplus production is a fraud and a steal but our surplus production price is fair and square and on the level. If Germany has the temerity to enforce on our goods her sanitary laws to which all nations are subject we are dreadfully shocked and cry out :

Germany boycotts American goods.

Of course, Germany is always in the wrong.

* * *

What is to be done?

It's unworthy for two mighty nations like the United States and Germany to squabble and to call each other names like street urchins. It's improper for them to eye each other constantly with suspicion like slick horse traders. There must be ways and means to put their trade relations permanently on a dignified basis.

The way, **and there is under the circumstances only one way**, consists in a joint reciprocity commission to be composed of members of Congress and of members of the *Reichstag*, accompanied by trade experts as attachés. This commission to meet either in Germany or in the United States for the purpose of talking matters over, comparing notes and agreeing on a detailed plan of reciprocity for mutual advantage. Diplomatic efforts having signally failed it is time for the legislative bodies to meet through a commission and come to an agreement on a fair and square business proposition. There is no doubt that such a joint commission, meeting man to man and arguing view to view could speedily settle the whole matter in a satisfactory way.

The proposition of such a Reciprocity Joint Commission has, we are glad to say, met with the full and unqualified approval of the leading diplomats, statesmen, intellectuals and businessmen, such as : Prince von Bülow, the German Chancellor ; the Honorable Andrew D. White, Ex-Ambassador to Germany ; Senator Thomas C. Platt of New York ; Senator Chauncey M. Depew of New York ; Senator Jacob H. Gallinger of New Hampshire ; Senator Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin ; Senator S. H. Piles of Washington ; Senator Geo. C. Perkins of California ; Senator B. R. Tillman of South Carolina ; Senator Wm. A. Clark of Montana ; President Ira Remsen of Johns Hopkins University ; President Woodrow Wilson of Princeton University ; President J. G. Schurman of Cornell University ; President Arthur T. Hadley of Yale University ; D. M. Parry, President of the National Association of Manufacturers ; F. A. Vanderlip, Vice-President of the National City Bank, New York ; Robert C. Ogden, in firm John Wanamaker, New York ; John A. Sleicher, President of the National Republican Editors Association, etc., etc.

The whole matter is of grave importance and in the interest of good relations and good will which have so happily existed between the two nations for over 100 years it is to be hoped that everything will be done to bring about an arrangement mutually beneficial long before the sixteen months, the period of grace, have elapsed.

HEINRICH CHARLES.

Germany Has Been Greatly Wronged.

The following article was published in the "American Economist," the official organ of the American Protective Tariff League, on January 12, 1906.

Germany not without provocation.

While in cordial agreement with the general tone of level headed Americanism which characterized a very able article in the "North American," of Philadelphia, on the subject of Tariff and trade relations between the United States and Germany, we must dissent from the statement that :

This nation has never threatened Germany, nor in any manner discriminated against its products. Our Tariff law is perfectly impartial. It has but one set of duties, which operate uniformly in all cases, irrespective of the origin of imports. What German goods pay at our ports of entry all other similar imports pay. Thus, at least, the Germans cannot truthfully say that we have imposed any special disabilities upon them as sellers in the American market. They are treated precisely as we treat everybody.

Not precisely. Has our neighbor of the "North American" forgotten that in the case of the existing "reciprocity" arrangement with Cuba we discriminate against a very important product of Germany? We grant to Cuban sugar an advantage of 20 per cent. in Tariff duties which we deny to German sugar.

At one time shortly prior to the enactment of the Cuban blunder we bought sugar from Germany at the rate of nearly \$10,000,000 a year. At present Germany sells us less than \$100,000 a year of sugar. Germany put in a protest against this gross favoritism at the time when the Cuban dicker was under consideration. That protest was ignored. We coolly elected to favor a country which was buying \$21,000,000 a year from us and to offend a country whose purchases from us were more than eight times \$21,000,000.

If anybody is looking for the origin of the German resentment which has now assumed the form of hostile Tariff discrimination against the exports of the United States he need look no farther back than the date of the existing "reciprocity" foolishness with Cuba. He will find it there.

While firmly determined upon standing fast to our Tariff and upon resisting the attempts of any or all foreign nations to force us to change that Tariff, let us not forget that in the present instance Germany is not altogether without provocation. The United States did a silly thing when it decided to play Cuba as a favorite. One of the first steps to be taken toward getting back to a friendly footing with Germany should be the abrogation by Congress of the Cuban "reciprocity" bargain. The big wigs of the Administration are figuring on a modus vivendi with Germany. Let them try that one. It would be a good thing in many ways.

Professor Muensterberg's Appeal.

Professor Hugo Muensterberg of Harvard University speaking on the duties and opportunities of Germans in America at a banquet of German Veterans in Boston, Mass., at the celebration of the silver wedding of the German Emperor made the following remarks :

"One thing above all was the natural province of the Germans in America. They alone were called to mediate between their old and their new home. They had seen both countries with the eyes of love; they had to prevent the coming of strife between these United States and the fatherland. Have the Germans really done enough in the direction of this evident duty?"

"I am not thinking, of course, of a war of armies. Whoever toys with the possibility of a real war between the two nations belongs no more to the circle of those who can be taken seriously, and when the poisoned arrows fly about, when the infamous lies are circulated intimating that Germany is looking for trouble in South America and is aiming at the colonies in Brazil, then every child knows that such inventions are fabricated for malicious purposes.

"In the battle of which I am thinking, the fighting is not with arms, but with high Tariff paragraphs. And yet who can deny that a real economic war would be a gigantic misfortune for the two nations which are to-day almost each other's best customers, and that all which has been built up in years of friendly rivalry and cultured exchange may break down with devastating effect as soon as the tension of real economic war sets in?

"I repeat, the German-Americans have not to make a separate hyphenate politics, and there are among them, as among any group of good Americans, Republicans and Democrats, stand-patters and revisionists; but party questions are not here under discussion. I am thinking of questions of justice and good-will.

"When Germany a few years ago laid down on a new basis her commercial policy toward the whole globe and made commercial treaties with some leading nations, she was logically obliged by the very concessions of the other countries to give warning to cease the one-sided favors so far given to the United States. Only one thing was essential to eliminate from this position every danger of war: it was necessary indeed to exclude all distortions of the situation.

"It was not to be tolerated that Germany's action should be misrepresented to mean a malicious attack, an attack which must naturally awake in every patriotic American the desire that Washington should show its readiness to retaliate with vigor. Here was a chance for the Germans to show their understanding of Germany. They had to convince the country that not the slightest discrimination against America was involved, no attack and no surprise, and that Germany was only doing just what America had done in exactly the same way a few years before.

"Public opinion, which always loves fair play, could then not help seeing that just after Germany's raising of duties the two countries stood like two friendly rivals in the field of sport, on equal ground with equal conditions to play.

"Instead of this there came at once a thunder of response that it was a patriotic duty of every congressman to punish Germany by a still higher American tariff, and ungenerous threatening destroyed the good sentiment so quickly that every hope for an immediate natural approach with concessions disappeared. The German government, in its steady, conscientious love of peace, once again this time avoided the unnecessary contest and reconsidered its move. The day after to-morrow there begins the just voted provisory regime in which Germany once more, at least for a year, gives every concession without receiving anything—an act provided only in the interest of peace. Yet, a year passes quickly.

"We celebrate to-day the silver wedding of the German Emperor, and everywhere the Germans of this country are assembled to-day to thank the great man who has furthered and advanced Germandom with such incessant energy. He has declined to receive personal presents, and has urged that all intended presents be transformed into public charitable foundations for the good of the commonwealth. I trust that this is meant for the spiritual as well as for the material gifts.

"The thoughts and feelings which to-day greet the brilliant Emperor—the most interesting figure on the world's stage, the one monarch who has given new meaning and new vital force to the monarchical idea—these thoughts and feelings ought not to be personal homage only; they ought to be transformed into moral foundations for the good of the world's peace.

"In this sense, I feel sure, we Germans here assembled—and I wish such a call might reach the Germans of the whole country—we ought to celebrate this German silver wedding day by a promise to work incessantly for the destruction of the absurd prejudice against Germany, and to do our best and utmost that before the year's provisory act comes to an end the public opinion of this country shall demand a commercial treaty on the new lines between the United States and the Fatherland, to the end that the two most able nations can maintain friendship and loyalty for many years to come. Such a resolution and such an achievement of the Germans in America would be the most splendid and the most beneficial gift at the silver wedding. Let us not part to-night without such a pledge and promise."

Views of Diplomats.

In an interview granted to the representative of the Associated Press in Berlin October 30th, last year Prince von Bülow, the German Chancellor, made the following statement:

"The simplest way to settle once for all the pending tariff questions between Germany and the United States of America would be if say ten persons from either side who are specially versed in tariff matters would meet around a table for a frank and friendly interchange of views and an amiable explanation of the respective position. A direct acquaintance with the standpoint of the opposition has always a healing and conciliating effect. Perhaps in this way an arrangement could be arrived at sooner and quicker.

"We sincerely wish such an understanding and we work hard in this direction with the consciousness that though wishes, interests and opinions might be different on both sides, still there is all possibility to get together if the general advantages of a sound reciprocity are kept in view."

ANDREW D. WHITE,
Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

The Germania Press,
5 Beekman Street, New York City.

October 6, 1905.

Gentlemen:

Replying to your letter of October 2nd, with document enclosed, I am heartily and entirely with you in the proposition made in the latter.

A commercial rupture between the United States and Germany, especially when it can be avoided by simple common sense and plain justice, would seem to be both a crime and a folly.

As you cogently point out, all the traditions of the two nations would be departed from in such a rupture, and not only so, but the best traditions among all the great civilized nations of the modern world would be violated.

Your suggestion of a conference, made up of reciprocity commissioners, with plenary powers, to be accompanied by trade experts from either side, seems to me admirable. With thanks to you for calling my attention to the subject, and with every good wish for your success, I remain,

Most sincerely and respectfully yours,

ANDREW D. WHITE,
Formerly United States Ambassador at Berlin.

VIEWS OF AMERICAN STATESMEN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

February 9, 1906.

Mr. Heinrich Charles,
Editor The Germania Press,
New York City.

My dear Sir:--

Replying to your letter of February seventh, I beg to say that a tariff war between two important nations is always deplorable and should be averted, if possible. I should be disposed to favor a settlement of the issues between Germany and the United States by the appointment of a joint commission to consider existing matters of difference.

Yours very truly,

T. C. PLATT,
United States Senator for New York.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

February 21, 1906.

Heinrich Charles, Esq.,
Editor, Germania Press,
5 Beekman St., New York.

Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of your letter of Febr. 20th.

I know of no better way to bring about a settlement of differences between nations on the tariff questions than by the appointment of such a commission as the one suggested.

Yours sincerely,

CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW,
United States Senator for New York.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

February 21, 1906.

Heinrich Charles, Esq.,
Editor, Germania Press,
5 Beekman St., New York.

Dear Sir:

I am in favor of every possible effort being made to avert a tariff war between this country and Germany, and the proposition to establish a joint commission, composed of members of congress and members of the Reichstag, accompanied by trade experts, appeals to me as very likely the best possible methods that can be adopted.

Yours respectfully,

J. H. GALLINGER,
United States Senator for New Hampshire.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Heinrich Charles,
5 Beekman St., New York City.

February 21, 1906.

My Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of your letter of the twentieth of February with reference to a commercial treaty between the United States and Germany. I should regard it as particularly unfortunate if there should arise any contest of a retaliatory nature to disturb the friendly commercial relations which have so long existed between Germany and this country.

I should be in favor of the appointment of a commission such as you suggest, for the purpose of considering these matters.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
United States Senator for Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Heinrich Charles,
Editor, Germania Press,
5 Beekman St., New York City, N. Y.

February 24, 1906.

Dear Sir:--

While I am averse to expressing for publication my views on matters affecting pending legislation, I would say in reply to your favor of the 20th instant, that I would welcome anything tending to cement good feeling between the United States and Germany. It is my opinion that a friendly exchange of views along the lines indicated by Prince von Bulow's statement, would have a beneficial effect.

Yours very truly,

S. H. PILES,
United States Senator for Washington.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Heinrich Charles,
Editor, The Germania Press, New York.

February 21, 1906.

Dear Mr. Charles:

I am in receipt of yours of the 19th inst., relative to the trade relations of the United States and Germany, and would say, that I shall approve of any honorable means for reaching an understanding that will avert a commercial war, and arrive at an understanding as to the trade necessities of the two countries that will enable a mutually advantageous arrangement to be arrived at. I think such a joint commission as is suggested would go far to bring about an understanding that would enable a satisfactory settlement to be made.

Yours very truly,

GEO. C. PERKINS,
United States Senator for California.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

February 21st, 1906.

Mr. Heinrich Charles,

Editor of The Germania Press, New York City.

Dear Sir:-

I have your letter of February 20th. I think the appointment of a joint commission to avert a tariff war between the United States and Germany would be a wise proceeding.

Very truly yours,

B. R. TILLMAN,
United States Senator for South Carolina.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

February 21, 1906.

Mr. Heinrich Charles, Editor,

The Germania Press, 5 Beekman Street, New York.

Dear Sir:-

I have your valued favor of the 20th pertaining to our relations with Germany on the tariff question. I believe that the suggestion of the Chancellor of the German Empire on this subject, is a good one, and I would be decidedly in favor of such a conference as is proposed in the suggestion made by him.

Yours very truly,

WM. A. CLARK,
United States Senator for Montana.

VIEWS OF UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, N. J.

President's Room.

February 21, 1906.

My Dear Sir:

In reply to your letter of the 17th, I would say that it seems to me that your suggestion of a conference between Germany and the United States, made up of reciprocity commissioners with plenary powers, is an excellent one.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. Heinrich Charles,
New York City.

WOODROW WILSON, President.

Office of the President,
CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, New York.

February 23, 1906.

Dear Sir:-

I should regard a tariff war between the United States and Germany as not only a great disaster but as colossal folly.

The two governments must understand one another's point of view, and both sides, I doubt not, will have to make concessions. The preliminary work might, as you well suggest, be done by a committee of Congress and a committee of the Reichstag; but after their work had been completed the problem would only have begun. The next and all-important step would be to bring the peoples and governments of both countries to a frame of mind in which they

would acquiesce in the findings of their representatives. This is to be accomplished by that process of education which speakers and especially newspaper writers have it in their power to bring about. I certainly am unwilling to believe that the American people will reject a proposition which reason accredits, which statesmanship commends, and which the interests and even the peace and mutual good relations of two great nations make imperatively necessary.

Very truly yours,

J. G. SCHURMAN, President.

Mr. Heinrich Charles,

Editor, The Germania Press,

5 Beekman Street, New York City.

President's Office.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,

Baltimore, Md.

February 20, 1906.

Dear Sir:-

I have received your letter of February 17th. I heartily approve of your method of dealing with the problem therein referred to. It seems to me that your suggestion is a very wise one, and as quoted in your letter, I find that the Chancellor of the German Empire has expressed views with which I am entirely in sympathy.

Everything should be done to avoid a commercial rupture between Germany and the United States. I can imagine no better way of avoiding it than that suggested by you. It is based upon common sense, which is the highest form of wisdom. I am,

Yours very truly,

IRA REMSEN, President.

Heinrich Charles, Esq.

YALE UNIVERSITY,

New Haven, Conn.

February 19th, 1906.

My dear Sir:-

I should lay great weight on whatever Mr. White said in a matter of this kind. Whether ten persons could be selected who could really make any promises for this country, or even create a basis of understanding, is a question which I do not like to answer offhand. You may, however, regard me as most heartily in favor of anything which will contribute to a better mutual understanding in these matters of international importance.

Faithfully yours,

ARTHUR T. HADLEY, President.

Mr. Heinrich Charles,

5 Beekman Street, New York.

VIEWS OF BUSINESSMEN.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,

Office of President, Indianapolis, Ind.

Nov. 13, 1905.

To The Germania Press,

5 Beekman Street, New York City.

Gentlemen:-

I owe you an apology for not having sooner answered a letter from you relating to the making of a commercial treaty between Germany and the United States. In some manner the letter became unfortunately misplaced. I have read the circular attached to the letter and I wish to say that I believe it offers a practical plan for the solution of the difficulty. My position is that there should be a treaty promptly formulated with Germany which will give this country the best terms possible, and a properly constituted joint commission seems to offer the best means that could be em-

ployed in arriving at an understanding that will be endorsed by the legislative bodies of both countries.

Hoping that you are meeting with encouragement in your efforts, I am
Yours very truly,

D. M. PARRY, President.

52 Wall Street, New York.

February 20, 1906.

Mr. Heinrich Charles,

The Germania Press, 5 Beekman Street.

Dear Sir:-

I am in receipt of your pamphlet in reference to German American Commercial Relations, and have read with interest your proposition to arrange for a conference to consider this most important subject. I quite agree with you that such a conference, if composed of the right men, and meeting in a spirit of good will and reciprocity, would do much toward bringing the two nations into a better mutual understanding, an understanding which might be very helpful in paving the way for wise legislation.

I cordially wish you every success in your effort to improve the present unsatisfactory relations between the German Empire and the United States, and am obliged to you for calling my attention to your admirable plan.

Very truly yours,

F. A. VANDERLIP,

Vice-President, National City Bank.

ROBERT C. OGDEN,

784 Broadway, New York.

Private Office,

February 19, 1906.

Heinrich Charles, Esq.,

The Germania Press, 5 Beekman Street, New York.

Dear Sir:-

Not being sufficiently posted upon international tariff questions to discuss them intelligently, I must limit my reply to yours of the 17th inst. to a cordial endorsement of the Hon. Andrew D. White's statements to you under date of October 8th, 1905. His opinions seem to be so thoroughly reasonable and wise that, in my judgment, they should control in the adjustment of German American commercial relations.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT C. OGDEN,

In Firm John Wanamaker.

EDITORIAL OPINION.

JUDGE COMPANY,

(Judge, Leslie's Weekly),

225 Fourth Avenue, New York.

February 21, 1906.

Mr. Heinrich Charles,

Editor, The Germania Press, 5 Beekman St., N. Y.

My dear Sir:-

I have your letter of the 19th, and am very favorably impressed by your suggestion that our trade differences with Germany might be most readily settled by the appointing of a joint commission, consisting of members of Congress and of the Reichstag, though I doubt the necessity of the addition of trade experts to this commission. No better experts on the subject of the tariff can probably be found than among the members of the American Congress, and I have no doubt that gentlemen equally gifted in this direction can be found in the Reichstag.

I am very glad that the suggestion has been made, and hope it will be carried out as speedily as possible, either in the present or a modified form. I am sincerely impressed by the need of not only retaining, but improving, the friendly relations which exist between Germany and our own country.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. SLEICHER.

Opinion of Congress Representative Bartholdt of Missouri.

Representative Bartholdt was asked by a representative of the "Germania Press" for his opinion with regard to the new German Tariff. Mr. Bartholdt spent several months in Germany last summer and has carefully noted the discussions in German newspapers of the trade relations between the United States and the German Empire. Though counted among the stand-patters, as far as the general revision of the Tariff is concerned, he strongly favors a reciprocity treaty with Germany. Such a treaty, in his opinion, would not involve a violation of the Republican principle of protection, but on the contrary, would be a confirmation of its wisdom. He says:

"Our Democratic friends are greatly mistaken when they assume that favoring reciprocity treaties means any sacrifice of principle with regard to protection. The difference between their position and ours is a radical one. They are striving to reduce duties as a matter of principle and irrespective of commercial consequences, while Republicans who are favoring reciprocity insist on a fair return for every concession they make, in accordance with the Latin maxim *Do ut des*. Accordingly in every case where a reduction of duty is granted through reciprocity, an equivalent must be given by the other nation which will open its market to American imports. So much for reciprocity in its general aspects. As to our trade relations with Germany it is but fair to keep in mind that in making her new Tariff Germany did not discriminate against any particular nation, but made its rates applicable to all alike except those who were willing to negotiate reciprocity treaties with her. It will not help matters in the present controversy to arouse animosities by alleging that German legislation was a drive at Uncle Sam. When at Berlin last September a number of American Congressmen, myself included, were the guests of the American Chamber of Commerce at Berlin. The members of that organization are all Americans doing business in Germany by selling American goods. The sentiment among these men was unanimous in favor of some reciprocal arrangement between the two countries by which their increasing trade would be protected. I distinctly remember the statements of a gentleman from California on this question, which were to the effect that he had built up an immense business in Germany by the sale of California dried fruits. From a small beginning he had gradually increased this business to about \$8,000,000 a year, and, he said, if the German Tariff went into effect against us, he would close his office, throw away the key and go back to California. In other words, he would be unable to do a dollar's worth of business under the new Tariff and the \$8,000,000 of American exports in this particular line would be wiped out. Similar statements were made by other gentlemen with respect to other classes of products and goods, and it then dawned upon me that it would be the part of wise statemanship to try and save this trade. I earnestly hope that an amicable arrangement may be reached which could be best promoted by discarding the idea prevailing in some quarters that we are confronted by a mere bluff which should be called. In the middle ages unscrupulous rulers might attempt such a thing, but diplomacy in the 20th century would not dare to play a game fraught with such dangers. For one I am for friendly relations with the great German empire and its people, and, in my judgment, a policy promoting them will be best for both.

"A tariff war, like every other war, works immeasurable injury to both contending parties, and an amicable understanding is generally less expensive than even a victory in such cases."